Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

TERRORISM: THE NATURE OF ITS HISTORY[1]

ARTHUR H. GARRISON*

Delaware Criminal Justice Council

Terrorism has a history that is at least 2000 years old. Although targets, victims, perpetrators, causes and justifications for the use of terror have changed, the methods of terrorism have remained the same throughout history. This article will review the developmental stages of terrorism to demonstrate that history defines terrorism as the use of violence to cause fear in order to force change in societal behavior or to force a society to acquiesce to the goals of the terrorist. The nature and history of terrorism will be reviewed from Roman occupation to modern militant Islamic terrorism.

Keywords: History of terrorism; Islam; Islamic fundamentalism; Islamism; Militant terrorism; Nature of terrorism

INTRODUCTION

On September 11, 2001, the United States suffered a surprise attack the results of which surpassed Pearl Harbor in the number of dead and injured. Nineteen men from Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Yemen and Lebanon hijacked four American planes, and within two hours of the hijackings, the third tallest building in the world was reduced to rubble, the Pentagon was seriously damaged and 3000 people were dead. The attack on September 11, 2001 caused the death of more Americans on the continental United States in one day than at any time since the Civil War. This second attack on the World Trade Center (the first was in February 1993) proved that the United States was no longer safe from terrorism on its own shores. September 11 demonstrated that terrorists could attack the United States with sophistication, planning and success on a large scale.

Terrorism today is a worldwide phenomenon. According to the FBI, 28 foreign terrorist organizations are designated as threats to the security of the United States (FBI, 2002). Iran, Iraq, Sudan, Libya, North Korea, Cuba and Syria are nations that support terrorist organizations, according to the State Department report on global terrorism (US State Department, 2002). Al-Qaeda, Osama bin Laden and the Taliban, previously only known to terrorism experts, are now known throughout the world.

September 11 left the United States, and the world, with many questions: What kind of people would hijack four planes with a plan that resulted in the deaths of 3000 people? What

---

kind of people would take their own lives to commit such acts? Are terrorists insane or simply evil? The answers to these questions, although multivariate, are not as complicated as some may argue. Terrorists are neither insane nor irrational. Terrorists are rational, deliberate and know why they are using terror. Terrorism, regardless of the reasons for the use of terror, is a method of changing behavior through the use of fear and intimidation. As Ezeldin (1987, p. 7) explains, "All terrorist organizations, however different their political orientations may be, have one feature in common. Rightist and leftist, liberationist and separatist, anarchist and subversive – all generally agree on methodology".

The purpose of this article is to provide a summary review of the history of terrorism, the use of terror and the development of methods and theories that have justified the use of terror over the past 200 years. This article does not purport to provide an exhaustive review of the development of terrorism or its use throughout history. The goal of this article is to introduce the history of terrorism and examine what history provides as an explanation for the use of terror. Terrorism can be defined objectively without subjective value judgments on the justness of the cause of the terrorist. The reasons or justifications asserted by the terrorist are not relevant to the definition of terrorism or the nature of terror.

DEFINING TERRORISM

When viewing terrorism from the desired effect and not by the political goals of the terrorist, terrorism becomes easy to understand and define. *Terrorism is the use of violence to create fear in the larger audience in order to create change in that larger audience*. Although reasons for the use of terror may or may not be just (and whether the cause is just, is a political assessment), what separates terrorism from acts of war or guerilla warfare is the desired effect of the use of terror, namely, installation of fear in the desired audience to cause behavior change, or change in policy. As discussed below, the defining of terrorism as a tool to institute fear is reflected in federal law and in academia.

The United States Code used for the State Department annual report on global terrorism defines terrorism as follows: "Terrorism is *premeditated, politically motivated violence* perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine state agents" (22 USCA 2657(f)(d), 1987, emphasis added).

The Code of Federal Regulations defines terrorism similarly: "Terrorism is the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to *intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment* thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives" (22 Code of Federal Regulations §0.85, emphasis added).

Federal law defines domestic terrorism as follows:

> Domestic terrorism involves *a violent or an act dangerous to human life* that is a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or any State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or any State; and appears to be *intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; to influence the policy of a Government by intimidation or coercion*; or to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping" (18 USCA 3077, emphasis added).

The FBI working definition of domestic terrorism includes the requirement that there be an absence of foreign involvement (FBI, 1999). The federal definition of international terrorism is an act violent or dangerous to human life that "occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or transcend national boundaries in terms of the means by which they are accomplished, the persons they appear *intended to intimidate or coerce*, or the locale in which their perpetrators operate or seek asylum" (18 USCA 2331,

emphasis added). The FBI working definition of international terrorism requires that the terrorist act be supported by a foreign government or organization (FBI, 1999).

Various researchers on terrorism have used similar definitions. Claridge defines terrorism as the "systematic threat or use of violence, whether for or in opposition to established authority, with the intention of communicating a political message to a group larger than the victim group by generating fear and so altering the behavior of the larger group" (Claridge, 1998, p. 66). Rosie explains that terrorism is the "use and/or threat of repeated violence in support of or in opposition to some authority, where violence is employed to induce fear of similar attack in as many non-immediate victims as possible so that those so threatened accept and comply with the demands of the terrorist" (Rosie, 1987, p. 7). Ezeldin defines terrorism as a "systematic and persistent strategy of violence practiced by a state or political group against another state or political group through a campaign of acts of violence . . . with the intent of creating a state of terror and public intimidation to achieve political ends" (Ezeldin, 1987, p. 40). In principle "it is not the nature of the perpetrator, or the type of violence that is used that makes an act a terrorist act, it is the effect that it has on the immediate victims, and upon a wider audience" (Claridge, 1998, p. 66).

Terrorism can be understood as a tool that has seven key components. Terrorism is (1) an intentional, (2) rational, (3) act of violence (4) to achieve a political goal (5) by causing fear (6) in the target audience or society (7) in order to change behavior in that audience or society.

The terrorist is not driven by personal desires or ambitions. Terrorist violence is a means to an end because the violence is less important than the result of the violence. "[T]he desired result is to spread a state of panic to influence decision making. The psychological effect, not the victim, is the target because terrorist acts are directed toward political adversaries, not individuals. The victims bear the message that all places and persons are subject to attack" (Ezeldin 1987, p. 35). Viewing terrorism by its component parts without making subjective moral judgments on the asserted goals of the terrorist allows for unbiased labeling of terrorism and differentiating acts of terror from other forms of violence, criminal activity and war, conventional or asymmetrical.

THE NATURE OF TERRORISM AND TERROR

One method of reviewing terrorism involves analysis of the damage to the greater society that the terrorist wants to create. This conception allows for the categorization of terrorism weapons into three methods of attack:

1. weapons of mass destruction;
2. weapons of mass casualty; and
3. weapons of mass disruption.

A weapon of mass destruction causes damage to the infrastructure of a society. Targets for mass destruction can include bridges, dams, water treatment plants, computer systems and any other structure. A weapon of mass casualty causes massive sickness and/or death. Biological and chemical weapons are weapons of mass casualty. Weapons of mass disruption cause social, political and/or economic disruption to society. Magnetic pulse weapons (to disrupt computer operations), agro-terrorism (disrupt food supply or manufacturing) and cyber-terrorism (hacking into computers and destroying bank records or government records) are examples of weapons of mass disruption. A terrorist act can involve an attack that achieves all three goals, such as the attack on September 11. The attack on September 11 was one of mass destruction of

infrastructure (the destruction of the World Trade Center and damage to the Pentagon), mass casualty (3000 people killed) and mass disruption (airports shut down, new laws passed, heightened fear of future attacks, the cultural loss of the third tallest building in the world, new behaviors at airports, the loss of millions of dollars because of the loss of the World Trade Center as an economic center).

While terrorism generally is aimed at creating fear in a society to achieve a political goal, an act of terrorism can be understood as either being objective-driven or terror-driven. An objective-driven act of terrorism is committed in order to get demands of the terrorist group met by a government. One example of objective terrorism is hostage taking. The taking of the United States embassy in Iran in 1980 was committed in order to get the United States to change its policy toward Iran and secure frozen assets of Iran in the United States. An objective-driven act of terrorism gives the government time to negotiate or change policy. Terror-driven acts of terrorism are committed as retaliation for a perceived wrong or as a warning of future acts of terror if the government does not change its policies. The acts of terrorism in the Gaza Strip and West Bank are examples of terror-driven attacks. An example of a terror-driven act is a car bomb exploding in Israel or in a Jewish settlement in the West Bank or Gaza in retaliation for an assassination of a Hamas leader by Israeli forces.

The nature of modern terrorism includes the indiscriminate and indirect targeting of individuals. People killed in the bombing of a bus in Israel or at work in the World Trade Center, are not targeted specifically and the people killed are of no specific interest to the terrorist. Terrorism is not an irrational act; targets are chosen because they will have a desired impact, such as destruction of infrastructure, significant loss of life and/or disruption of a society. The nature of modern terrorism is that targets are not chosen randomly, but victims of terrorism are random (because they are in the wrong place at the wrong time) and the appearance of randomness causes public anxiety, fear and behavior change. Terrorism is also a public act; the greater society must see and react to the attack. The terrorist chooses targets that have symbolic or economic value (such as the World Trade Center), or targets that have public value (buses, restaurants, etc.) in order to get the society's attention and cause governments to change policies.

Distinctions Between Terrorism, War and Crimes of War

Terrorism should not be confused with traditional warfare. In war, a target is selected because it has military value and will achieve a specific military objective. In modern warfare, a specific target is attacked or destroyed because the action serves a specific military necessity, achieves a specific result (utility) and leads to a specific goal (objective) while limiting colateral damage (proportional use of force) to the civilian population. In terrorism, the target is of little interest, per se. What is important is that the target will realize a certain reaction on the part of the greater society. The terrorist group that plants an altitude bomb on the plane does not target the 270 passengers on the flight. The intended effect on the world when that plane is destroyed over a populated area is what makes the act terrorism. Conversely, an Israeli jet dropping a bomb on an apartment building to assassinate a specific person, for example, a senior officer of Hamas, is not an act of terrorism. The specific goal of the attack was to assassinate the Hamas leader, not to cause fear in order to change behavior in Hamas, the Palestine Liberation Organization or the Palestinians. The other people killed were collateral casualties. Terrorism is not defined by the fact that life is lost in an act of violence or the amount of life that is lost. Terrorism is defined by the intended effect of the use of violence and the purpose of the terrorist act. There is a difference between the use of violence on a target because the target has an intrinsic and specific value, and the use of violence on

a target that has no intrinsic or specific value, but is attacked in order to effect the larger audience watching the attack. The former is an act of war; the latter is terrorism.

Some researchers do not agree that there is a distinction between terrorism and war, and assert that terrorism is warfare against civilians, a tactic that has a long history (Carr, 2002). Carr, for example, asserts that terrorism is part of the development of war: "Terrorism, in other words, is simply the contemporary name given to, and the modern permutation of, warfare deliberately waged against civilians with the purpose of destroying their will to support either leaders or policies that the agents of such violence find objectionable" (Carr, 2002, p. 6).

This formulation makes no distinction between acts committed in war to cause an enemy to surrender and acts committed to intimidate and cause policy change. For example, there is a difference between General Sherman's march through South Carolina (to cause the surrender of the Confederacy and divide the south in two, thus separating Lee's army from supplies and aid) and Osama bin Laden sending 19 men to hijack four planes to crash them into the World Trade Center. The former was committed to bring an end to a war and prevent a city from aiding an enemy force; the latter was to cause death and destruction. The 266 passengers and crew on the four hijacked planes were not the targets of the attack, nor were the estimated 2500 people inside World Trade Center building. The goal was to cause massive loss of life and property, and to send a message to the United States and the world, to force policy change in the United States.

There is also a difference between terrorism and war crimes. An example of a war crime is an army invading a town to purge it of enemy forces, and while doing so intentionally killing unarmed civilians and non-combatants. Although this action is both immoral and criminal, it is not terrorism. In this example, people were killed because members of the army lost control of themselves, not to intimidate other towns or the society as a whole to achieve a political objective.

Summary

Terrorism is a rational political act designed to achieve a desired goal through the use of violence. The terrorist does not act for personal gain or gratification, thus the terrorist is not a criminal in the traditional sense. A terrorist believes in what he (and now with female suicide bombers, she) is doing. For the terrorist, achieving the desired objective is worth the life of the terrorist and the lives of people killed or injured. A terrorist attack can be intended to destroy buildings, the operations of a society, to kill or injure people, to disrupt the peaceful existence of the society or any combination of the above. The objective can be to force a government to negotiate or to seek revenge for a governmental action. Terrorism does not seek specific victims, but it does seek specific targets for a specific outcome.

THE HISTORY OF TERRORISM

The following historical review is designed to show how modern terrorism and the use of terror have developed. The goal of this section is not to provide a detailed review of each historical stage, but rather to show that terrorism has a historical and theoretical developmental history. Each stage is briefly discussed in order to show how the use of terror developed as a tool to achieve specific goals and objectives. The review also demonstrates that methods of terrorism have not changed through history and only the political goals, objectives, targets, tools of implementation, perpetrators and victims of terror have changed.

Religion and Terror are Old Companions

Religion and terrorism have been companions throughout history (Rapoport, 1984; D'Alessio and Stolzenberg, 1990; Kelly and Cook, 1995). The history of terrorism and religion dates back almost 2000 years ago when the Jewish resistance group known as Sicarii-Zealots (AD 66–72) "carried out terrorist campaigns to force insurrection against the Romans in Judea. These campaigns included the use of assassins (sicarii, or daggermen), who would infiltrate Roman-controlled cities and stab Jewish collaborators or Roman legionnaires with a sica (dagger), kidnapping members of the staff of the Temple Guard to hold for ransom, or use poison on a large scale" (Hudson, 1999, p. 17). Note the justification for the acts: the "killings demonstrated the consequences of the immorality of collaborating with the Roman invaders, and that the Romans could not protect their Jewish collaborators" (Hudson, 1999, pp. 17–18). The purpose of the terrorist acts was to cause behavior change, through the use of terror and fear, in the larger Jewish society. The victims of the terror, Jewish collaborators, were a means to an end.

The English word *assassin* comes from a Shiite Muslim sect (Nizari Isma'ilis – also known as *hashashins* or "hashish-eaters"), who fought Sunni Muslims (1090–1275), and during medieval Christendom resisted occupation during the Crusades (1095–1291). They were known to spread terror through murder, their victims including women and children. The hashashins, also known as the Brotherhood of Assassins, committed terror to gain 72 virgins in paradise, if killed, and receive unlimited hashish while on earth.

The Reign of Terror in France (1793–1794)

Modern terrorism began with Maximilien Robespierre and the Jacobin Party's Reign of Terror. It was during this period that the term "terrorism" was first used. As Parry explains "Robespierre's reign was the first terror organized nationwide by revolutionaries actually seizing power and becoming a punitive government proclaiming murder as the law of the land" (Parry, 1976, p. 39). Robespierre initiated the idea that terrorism has utility as a tool to achieve governmental ends, and he used terror systematically to suppress opposition to his government. Robespierre introduced *government-sponsored terrorism: the use of terror to maintain power and suppress political rivals*.

Through the establishment of the Committee of Public Safety and the Revolutionary Tribunal the *regime de la terreur* began, and between May 1793 and July 1794 "the new government sponsored widespread surveillance of all strata of society, searching for possible enemies of the revolution [depicting] themselves as saviors of the people" (Griset and Mahan, 2003, p. 4). Robespierre justified arrests, executions, torture, banishment and other acts of terror as "the solution to internal anarchy and external invasion . . . all in the name of the revolutionary cause" (Griset and Mahan, 2003, p. 4).

Note that from the beginning of the systematic use of terror, there is always an assertion that a moral principle is being protected or advanced. For as Robespierre explained, the "revolutionary government . . . bases itself on the holiest of all laws – the good of the people; and on the most inalienable of all rights – necessity" (Parry, 1976, p. 48). Before the *regime de la terreur* was over, thousands of people had met their ends with the sound of the guillotine.

The Anarchists (1871–1914)

Anarchists, who believe in abolishing all government, were very active throughout Europe during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The most notorious anarchist group

was the Russian anarchists group, Narodnaya Volya (1878–1881). Narodnaya Volya sought to assassinate, among other czars, Czar Alexander II, and eventually succeeded in 1881. Anarchists believed that killing the czar and other kings and nobles of Europe would bring down the governments of Europe. To achieve their goals, anarchists introduced *individual terrorism – the selective use of terror against an individual or group*. The use of terror was selective because targets were chosen based on their governmental titles and positions in the nobility. Individual terrorism is target-specific in that the terrorist acts are controlled to limit collateral injury to innocent bystanders. The concept of limited collateral damage and not targeting innocents did not survive the second half of the twentieth century.

In addition to introducing individual terrorism, anarchists developed the concept of *propaganda by deed – terrorism has a communicative effect*. According to anarchist theory, the masses are asleep and need to be awakened so that they can be unified to revolt. In other words terrorism would stir the spirit of revolt within the masses. *The use of terrorism will communicate to the masses that they can revolt, as well as communicating to the ruling class that they are not beyond the reach of the people, who resist their oppression*. As Laqueur recounts of Narodnaya Volya theory, "If ten or fifteen of the establishment were killed at one time and the same time, the government would panic and would lose its freedom of action. At the same time, the masses would wake up" (Laqueur, 1977, p. 34).

The Russian anarchists, like all terrorists, were not without a moral justification for their activities. The protection of former serfs from the Russian aristocracy and securing promised land, justified Sergey Nechaev in *Catechism of the Revolutionist* to assert that the terrorists "sole and constant object is the immediate destruction of this vile order . . . For him, everything is moral which assists the triumph of revolution. Immoral and criminal is everything which stands in its way" (Laqueur, 1978, pp.68–69).

Between 1890 and 1908, anarchists were responsible for killing the kings and queens of Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy and Portugal as well as the President of France. Anarchists were also active in the United States between 1890 and 1910, setting off bombs on Wall Street. The two most widely known acts by anarchists were the assassinations of President McKinley (1901) and of Archduke Ferdinand (1914), which started the "war to end all wars."

The Soviet Revolution (1917)

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin studied the theories of Maximilien Robespierre and refined them to provide methods and justifications for modern terrorists throughout the world (Parry, 1976). Lenin and later Stalin refined the idea of government-sponsored terrorism as a tool for maintaining control over society as a whole and as a tool to reconstruct and build a new society. Lenin and Stalin used terror systematically against the entire society, as opposed to using terror solely against political rivals. Fear provided a motivational factor for public compliance with government, and terror proved useful for controlling a society. After Stalin solidified his hold on power in Russia, he exported the use of terror as a tool of liberation from capitalism and imperialism throughout the world (Francis, 1985) and after World War II Soviet leaders provided training in the methodology of terror as a tool against the West in the Cold War. Eastern European nations that came under the influence of the Soviet Union after the war assisted in spreading the methods of terror. For example, in 1952 the *Document on Terror* was published (Rapoport and Alexander, 1980). The *Document on Terror*, discovered on the body of a dead NKVD officer in Poland in 1948, provides detailed explanations on the systematic and the methodological use of terror and limitations on the effectiveness of the use of terror by governments and anti-capitalist (socialist) organizations.

The Irish Rebellion (I919–1921)

The Irish Rebellion of 1919 added three tactical methods to the development of terrorism:

1. selective terrorism
2. sustained terror over time
3. cell operations.

Led by Michael Collins, the IRA's goal was to gain Irish independence from England. Terrorist acts were committed against representatives of England, such as police, soldiers, judges and government officials, in an effort to make the cost of maintaining continued occupation too high. The IRA, under Collins, implemented *selective terrorism*, *acts of terror against representatives of a target class, to achieve political objectives*. The use of terror was limited to members of the selected class: representatives of the British government operating in Ireland. Terrorism in the second half of the 20th century has discarded the selective aspect, today's terrorism involves attacks on civilians and non-governmental officials.

   The Irish Rebellion of 1919 demonstrated that, to be successful, terror must be sustained over a long period of time, because *sustained terror will, over time, break down the will of the targeted government, which eventually will seek an accommodation*. Finally, a new operational tactic was added to organized terrorism – cell operation. Cell operation decentralizes the implementation of terrorist acts and prevents discovery and destruction of the terrorist organization. Each cell has a specific goal or objective and knows only its members and their specific task. Thus, the capture of one cell does not provide information about other cells or the terrorist organization. This decentralized design was used to implement the attack on September 11. Cells in Europe and the United States had specific objectives. Terrorist cells can be understood by their tasks: intelligence cells (which conduct surveillance, select targets, gather information); logistical cells (which secure money, secure passports, create false identification, secure safe houses); and tactical/operational cells (which supply needed manpower for operations, carry out the terrorist act).

The Hindustan Socialists Republican Association – India (1929)

The Indian struggle for independence from British rule provided the world with two theories, non-violent, non-cooperative, civil disobedience, and the *Philosophy of the Bomb*. The former was the philosophy of Gandhi and the latter is a philosophy which asserted that *terrorism is inevitable in the struggle from oppression to freedom, thus the use of terror is a justifiable means to a justifiable end*. The Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (HSRA) published a manifesto in 1929 called the *Philosophy of the Bomb* to answer criticism by Gandhi after the HSRA attempted, but failed, to assassinate the British Viceroy.

   The manifesto offered a detailed and sophisticated theoretical explanation and justification for the use of terror. First, oppression is experienced by youth who desire freedom and therefore develop hatred for the oppressor – thus terrorism is born in the oppressed country. The use of terror develops as a natural reaction in the young of a people who are oppressed. Second, terrorism is an inevitable phase of revolution, which is inevitable to secure freedom. Third, terrorism instills fear in the heart of the oppressor, gives courage to the oppressed and shatters the idea of the superiority of the oppressor. Forth, violence is the only way to achieve freedom. Fifth, self respect and pride in one's civilization demands the resistance to the oppressor.

The five principles in the *Philosophy of the Bomb* provide the terrorist with a moral justification for violence, and murder without condemnation. To secure the independence of one's nation, culture, self respect and honor is not only worth dying for, but also is worth killing for. Although the *Philosophy of the Bomb* did not prevail in India as a method of securing freedom from British rule, it added to the development of terrorism the idea that the use of terror is not only a tool to secure freedom, but is an inevitable tool to be used on the road to securing desired objectives. In other words terror is not a tool of choice, but a tool of necessity.

Post-World War II Development

Terrorism continued to be used as a tool for liberation and ending colonialism in the Third World after World War II. Between the late 1940s and the 1960s, terrorism changed from selectively targeting government officials to targeting civilians and sympathizers of occupation in Africa and the Middle East. The 1960s brought an international scope to terrorism, with the familiar focus on the Middle East. After the 1967 war in which Israel defeated Jordan, Egypt and Syria, and took control of the Golan Heights (from Syria), East Jerusalem and the West Bank (from Jordan) and the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula (from Egypt), the use of conventional war as a means to destroy Israel ended, and the use of terror for the purpose of focusing attention on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict began.

Cuba and the Tri-Continental Conference (1966)

In 1966, Cuba hosted the Tri-Continental Conference, sponsored by the Soviet Union. The Tri-Continental Conference marked the beginning of the internationalization of terrorism. Terrorist and "liberation" groups from Europe, Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America began to work together to create financial, political, operational and logistical cooperation that transcended national boundaries. Terrorism was no longer limited to geographic regions, with specific goals and objectives based on specific geographic issues. Terrorism became transnational. International terrorism flourished over the next 20 years.

In the 1970s, Europe suffered a decade of terrorist activity as European and Middle East terrorist groups worked together to bring attention to the Palestinian cause. In Germany, the Red Army Faction (German group) allied itself with Black September (Palestinian group); in France, Action Direct (French group) allied itself with the Red Army Faction and the Red Army Brigade (Italian group); in Japan, the Japanese Red Army allied with the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Cuba became a training ground for terrorist groups. Transnational terrorists considered themselves citizens of no particular country, but rather bound by common political, social or personal objectives that transcended nation/state boundaries (Kushner, 1998).

Terrorism, the Middle East and the Cold War

As the Cold War escalated in the 1960s, with the world polarized between East and West, a new dynamic developed in transnational terrorism, *state-sponsored terrorism: government exported terrorism to other parts of the world for their own political interests*. Iran supported Hezbollah; Libya supported Abu Nidal; and Iraq, Cuba, Sudan and Algeria provided training camps, as well as economic and political support to terrorist groups around the world. Terrorism moved to the Middle East and the Arab–Israeli conflict, with the United States supporting Israel, and the Soviet Union supporting various Arab countries.

It was during this time that terrorists begun choosing airplanes as targets. The 1970s were known as the decade of air terrorism, with more than 20 hijacking, bombing and hostage-taking incidents directed against European and American airlines. The 1970s also experienced bombings, kidnappings and other types of terrorist activity throughout Europe, perpetrated by anarchists, socialists and other middle-class malcontents.

Terrorism, the Middle East and Islamism

Islamism, or fundamentalist Islam, has the specific goal of bringing about an Islamic world in which a seventh-century interpretation of the Qur'an governs society. Islamism comprises both those who believe that an Islamic world can come about through converting the infidel, and those who support the use of force to remove the infidel from the world. Islamic fundamentalists view as corrupt any Arab government that does not govern by Islamic law with a strict seventh-century interpretation. The goal is to remove Western cultural, social, political and religious influences from the Middle East and reintroduce Islamic law throughout the Arab world. Nations like Egypt and Saudi Arabia are seen as collaborators with the West in the subjugation of Islam, the will of Allah and the Arab world. The United States is viewed as a socially, religiously and morally corrupt state, whose influence must be removed from the Middle East and from the world, either through conversion or destruction. The two most fundamentalist schools of Islam are the Shiite Hanbali school and the Sunni Wahhabi school, which believe that only a seventh-century interpretation and application of the Qur'an and Islamic law are acceptable. Both schools support an anti-Christian, anti-modernization, and anti-Western theology. Most of the terrorists who implemented the September 11 attacks have been students at Muslim religious schools dominated by either the Hanbali or Wahhabi schools of thought.

Terrorism and Islamic Fundamentalism

The last two decades of the twentieth century brought terrorism full circle. With the rise of the Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran in 1979, religious-based terrorism returned. Militant Islam and the protection of Islam against Jews, Christians and the West, specifically the United States, formed an independent (of the Israeli–Arab/Palestinian conflict) justification for terrorism. As Osama bin Laden asserted in his *Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders* fatwa on February 23, 1998 (emphasis added):

> . . . the United States has been occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest of places plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers, humiliating its people, terrorizing its neighbors and turning its bases in the Peninsula into a spearhead through which to fight the neighboring Muslim peoples.

> . . . the aim is also to serve the Jews' petty state and divert attention from its occupation of Jerusalem and murder Muslims there . . . to guarantee Israel's survival and the continuation of the brutal crusade occupation of the peninsula. All these crimes and sins committed by the Americans are a clear declaration of war on God, his messenger and Muslims.

> Praise be to God, who . . . says in His Book ". . . then fight and slay the pagans wherever ye find them, seize them, beleaguer them, lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war)"; and peace be unto our Prophet . . . who said: I have been sent with the sword between my hands to ensure that no one but God is worshipped, God who put my

livelihood under the shadow of my spear and who inflicts humiliation and scorn on those who disobey my orders.

The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies – civilians and military – is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim.

We – with God's help – call on every Muslim who believes in God and wishes to be rewarded to comply with God's order to kill the Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it.

The 1998 *fatwa* followed a *Declaration of War Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places* by bin Laden issued on August 23, 1996, which listed a host of sins committed by the West, specifically America:

It should not be hidden from you that the people of Islam had suffered from aggression, iniquity and injustice imposed on them by the Zionist-Crusaders alliance and their collaborators; to the extent that the Muslims' blood became the cheapest and their wealth as loot in the hands of the enemies. Their blood was spilled in Palestine and Iraq. The horrifying pictures of the massacre of Qana, in Lebanon are still fresh in our memory. Massacres in Tajakestan, Burma, Cashmere, Assam, Philippine, Fatani, Ogadin, Somalia, Erithria, Chechnia and in Bosnia-Herzegovina took place, massacres that send shivers in the body and shake the conscience. All of this and the world watch and hear, and not only didn't respond to these atrocities, but also with a clear conspiracy between the USA and its allies and under the cover of the iniquitous United Nations, the dispossessed people were even prevented from obtaining arms to defend themselves.

The people of Islam awakened and realised that they are the main target for the aggression of the Zionist-Crusaders alliance. All false claims and propaganda about "Human Rights" were hammered down and exposed by the massacres that took place against the Muslims in every part of the world.

The latest and the greatest of these aggressions, incurred by the Muslims since the death of the Prophet (ALLAH'S BLESSING AND SALUTATIONS ON HIM) is the occupation of the land of the two Holy Places – the foundation of the house of Islam, the place of the revelation, the source of the message and the place of the noble Ka'ba, the Qiblah of all Muslims – by the armies of the American Crusaders and their allies. (We bemoan this and can only say: "No power and power acquiring except through Allah".)

Fundamentalist Islam operates under two premises,

1. that the West has insulted, killed and looted Muslims because they are Muslim, and
2. Allah requires that such infidels be killed.

The *fatwa* and *Declaration of Jihad* issued by Osama bin Laden assert both of these premises and call for Muslims, especially the youth, to rise up against the infidel. The result of fundamentalist Islamists like bin Laden can be seen in religious suicide martyrdom, through which young men and women die in the service of Allah, in the West Bank, Gaza Strip and New York City.

TABLE I   Middle Eastern/Radical Islamist-inspired Terrorist Acts against United States Interests in the 1980s.

1979: hostages taken in Tehran, Iran	1986: bombing of a West German discotheque frequented by American military personnel
1983: truck bombing of US marine barracks in Beirut	1986: hijacking of TWA Flight 407
1983: car bombs explode in front of the US and French embassies in Kuwait City	1986: Pan Am jet hijacked on the ground at Karachi Airport
1984: bombing of the US embassy annex in Beirut	1986: TWA Boeing 727 exploded from bomb under a seat while flying from Rome to Athens
1984: hijacking of Kuwait Airlines 221; two Americans killed	
1985: hijacking of TWA 847. A US navy diver is killed and 39 Americans are held hostage for 17 days	1984: kidnapping of Americans by Hezbollah and other terrorist groups
1985: hijacking of the Achille Lauro, and bombing of the Rome and Vienna airports	1988: bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland

Terrorism and Islamic Fundamentalism: Focus on the United States

The 1980s were known as a decade of hostage taking, with terrorism finding a target in American interests around the world (see Table I). These incidents included the 1979 hostage crisis, bombing of United States embassies, kidnapping of American citizens and bombing of airplanes. The terrorism of the 1980s affected America at the highest levels as the desire to gain the release of hostages in Lebanon and other areas of the Middle East led to the political and foreign policy "arms for hostages" Iran-Contra debacle in 1985–1986.

The last decade of the twentieth century provided the most recent change in the development of terrorism. Middle Eastern-based terrorism in the 1960s and 1970s was about gaining publicity for a cause; even in the 1980s, as more American interests were targeted, a terrorist act usually was followed by credit taking or a warning that future attacks would occur if the United States did not change its policies. The 1990s brought to terrorism the indiscriminate killing of civilians and high mass-casualty counts. According to the FBI, "It does appear that international terrorists will continue to focus on attacks that yield significant destruction and high casualties, thus maximizing worldwide media attention and public anxiety" (FBI, 1999, p. 37).

Terrorism became a tool to create high casualties with fewer incidents. Although the number of worldwide terrorist incidents has decreased, the number of people killed or injured has been increasing.

> The last decade . . . witnessed a general shift in tactics among international terrorists away from numerous direct, but limited attacks, such as hijackings and hostage taking, toward fewer indiscriminate, high impact attacks, such as large-scale vehicle bombings. The trend toward high-casualty, indiscriminate attacks served to spark public anxiety regarding terrorism even as the overall number of terrorist attacks generally declined during the decade (there were 392 international terrorist attacks worldwide in 1999, compared to 565 in 1991) (FBI, 1999, p. 37).

Between 1993 and September 11, 2001, seven Middle Eastern-inspired terrorist attacks were committed against the United States, with destruction as their goal. The first World Trade Center attack in 1993 claimed six lives and caused major building damage. In 1995, a car bomb left five dead at the United States military headquarters in Saudi Arabia; and in 1996, also in Saudi Arabia, 19 died in at the Khobar Towers. In 1997, 58 tourists were killed when

terrorists opened fire in the Temple of Hatshepsut in Egypt. In Kenya and Tanzania, 224 died in the simultaneous 1998 bombings of two United States embassies. In Yemen, 17 sailors were killed by the attack on the USS Cole in 2000. Finally, in 2001, the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks killed an estimated 3000 people. These seven incidents over nine years accounted for more than 3300 people killed.

CONCLUSION

As Solomon observed, there is nothing new under the sun. Although the goals, objectives, victims, tools of implementation, locations and justifications for terrorism have changed over history, the methods used have remained the same. Terrorism has been justified by religious and secular logic and justifications. Over the past 200 years, terrorism has developed from a tool of religious zealots, to a tool for consolidation of governmental power, to a tool used by anarchists to bring down governments, to a tool to unify a society, to a tool for liberation, to a tool of the Cold War, and in the last decade of the twentieth century, to a tool of religious suicidal terrorists.

The history of the past two hundred years defines terrorism as the utilization of terror in order to change behavior. This basic understanding of terrorism does not change according to the stated goals of the terrorist. Thus one man's terrorist is not another man's freedom fighter. A terrorist selects a target to cause fear in the larger society and inflects terror on a society to force political, social, and economic change. The user of terror can seek freedom, to solidify governmental power, or to achieve international objectives. It's the tactics, not the objective, which define a terrorist.

In the minds of terrorists, their ideals are worth both dying for and killing for. The terrorist is a true believer to the cause. At his trial in 1887, Alexander Ulyanov, member of Narodnaya Volya, who tried to assassinate Czar Alexander III, summarized terrorism in the mind of the true believer: Terrorism "is the only form of defense to which a minority, strong only in terms of its spiritual strength and in its knowledge of the rightness of its beliefs, can resort against the physical strength of the majority" (Lincoln, 1983, p. 172).

Bibliography

Alamut: Bastion of Peace and Information. *The Secret Doctrines of the Assassins*. Retrieved May 2003, from http://www.alamut.coni/subj/ideologies/alamut/secDoctrines.html

Allen, R. (1997). *Asymmetric Warfare: Is the Army Ready?* Retrieved May 2003, from http:/www/amsc.belvoir-.army.mil/asymmetric-warfare.htm

Banks, T. (1995). *Airline and Airport Terrorism: A Thing of the Past – or the Future?* Retrieved May 2003, from http://www.pollux.com/aeroweb/I 996/may96/terror.htm

Carr, C. (2002). *The Lesson of Terror: A History of Warfare against Civilians, Why it has Always Failed and Why it will Fail Again*. New York: Random House.

Claridge, D. (1998). State Terrorism? Applying a definitional model. In B. Schechtennan, and M. Slann (Eds.), *Violence and Terrorism 98/99*, 4th ed. Guilford, CT: Annual Editions, pp. 64–72.

Craig, D. (1998). *Asymmetrical Warfare and the Transnational Threat: Relearning the Lessons from Vietnam*. Retrieved from http://www.cfcsc.dnd.ca/irc/amsc/amscl/006.html

D'Alessio, S., and L. Stolzenberg (1990). Sicarii and the rise of terrorism. *Terrorism*, **13**, 329–335.

Ezeldin, A. (1987). *Terrorism and Political Violence: An Egyptian Perspective*. Chicago: Office of International Criminal Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago.

FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) (1999). *Terrorism in the United States, 1999*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) (2002). *Designated Foreign Terrorist Organization List*. Retrieved May 2003, from http://www.fbi.gov/terrorinfo/ftolist.htm

Francis, S. (1985). *The Soviet Strategy of Terror*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

Garrison, A. (Ed.) (2002). *Terrorism: Past, Present and Future – A Training Course*. Wilmington, DE: The Delaware Criminal Justice Council.

Greenberg, D (2001). *The Changing Face of Terrorism*. Retrieved from http://www.slate.msn.com/HistoryLesson/ 01–09–13/HistoryLesson.asp

History Channel. (2001). *Terrorism: 100 Years of History* (video). New York: A and E Television Networks.

Griset, P., and S. Mahan (2003). *Terrorism in Perspective*. London: Sage Publications.

Hudson, R. (1999). *Who Becomes a Terrorist and Why: The 1999 Government Report on Profiling Terrorists*. Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press.

Kash, D. (1998). An international legislative approach to 21st century terrorism. In H. Kushner (Ed.) *The Future of Terrorism: Violence in the Millennium*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 163–172.

Kelly, R., and W. Cook (1995). Extremism and fundamentalism: the return to paradise. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, **11**(1), 13–34.

Krueger, A., and J. Maleckova (2002). *Education, Poverty, Political Violence and Terrorism: Is there a Causal Connection?* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Kushner, H. (1998). The New Terrorism. In H. Kushner (Ed.) *The Future of Terrorism: Violence in the Millennium*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 3–20.

bin Laden, O. (1996). *Declaration of War Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places August 23, 1996*. Retrieved May 2003, from Delaware Criminal Justice Council Terrorism Research Page http://www.state.de.us/cjc/TERROR.HTM

bin Laden, O. (1998). *Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders February 23, 1998*. Retrieved May 2003, from Delaware Criminal Justice Council Terrorism Research Page http://www.state.de.us/cjc/TERROR.HTM

Laqueur, W. (1977). *Terrorism*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Laqueur, W. (1978). *The Terrorist Reader: A Historical Anthology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Laqueur, W. (1987). *The Age of Terrorism*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Lincoln, W. (1983). *In War's Dark Shadow: The Russians before the Great War*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Parry, A. (1976). *Terrorism: From Robespierre to Arafat*. New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc.

Rosie, G. (1987). *The Dictionary of International Terrorism*. New York: Paragon House.

Rapoport, D. (1984). Fear and trembling: terrorism in three religious traditions. *American Political Science Review*, **78**(3), 658–677.

Rapoport, D., and Y. Alexander (1980). *The Morality of Terrorism: Religious and Secular Justification*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Simonsen, C., and J. Spindlove (2000). *Terrorism Today: The Past, the Players, the Future*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Staten, C. (1998). *Asymmetric Warfare, the Evolution and Devolution of Terrorism: The Coming Challenge for Emergency and National Security Forces*. Retrieved May 2003, from http://www.emergency.com/ aymetrc.htm

US State Department (2002). *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.

White, J. (2002). *Terrorism: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Biography

Arthur Garrison is a Criminal Justice Planning Coordinator with the Delaware Criminal Justice Council and is a graduate of the US Department of Justice, Institute for Intergovernmental Research State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training Program (SLATT). Mr Garrison has conducted research on terrorism and has provided training and research on terrorism to state and local law enforcement. Mr Garrison has published various articles in criminal justice and law journals, including the *Journal for Police and Criminal Psychology, Police Studies,* the *New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement, Court Review*, and the *American Journal of Trial Advocacy.* Mr Garrison received his BA from Kutztown University of Pennsylvania (1990) and an MS from West Chester University of Pennsylvania (1995).